

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/815,257	03/22/2001	Yutaka Kamezaki	55521 (70904)	6515
7.	590 11/05/2003		EXAMINER	
Edwards & Angell, LLP			NGUYEN, CHANH DUY	
P.O. Box 9169 Boston, MA			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
•			2675	<u> </u>
			DATE MAILED: 11/05/2003	3

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	09/815,257	KAMEZAKI ET AL.
7.20.00.77.00.0	Examiner	Art Unit
	Chanh Nguyen	2675
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address
THE REPLY FILED 14 October 2003 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avignal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this application a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper reply to a
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]	
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailin		•
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH	g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Officially filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	of extension and the corresponding amo the shortened statutory period for reply be later than three months after the mail	unt of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or
 A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF 		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:	
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	pelow);	
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceli	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.
NOTE:		
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):	•
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: Se		dered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bec raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		
Claim(s) allowed:		
Claim(s) objected to:		
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-43</u> .		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a) approved or b) disapp	roved by the Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen		•
10. Other:	(e)(/ 1 0 1 1 1 e) 1 apoi 110(e)	
10. Guler		Chandray M Chanh Nguyen Primary Examiner
		Primary Examiner V Art Unit: 2675

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the arguments presented by applicant are not persuasive since all the limitations recited in the claims are met by Osamu, Taku and Sato as set forth in the rejection. For example, applicant argues that the horizontal lines in vertical period as set forth in the claim 43 are the scanning lines for the input video signal, and are not data lines. However, claim 43 does not require the horizontal lines on vertical period being the scanning lines. Similar to argument to claim 33, the limitation "separately" is not recited in the claim 33 as applicant's argument. The term "individually" recited in claim 33 broadly reads on "non-display area" of Osamu is simultaneously scanned, even the term "separately" still can be read on the scanning circuit of Osamu separately scanned display area and non-display area. Again, all the limitations recited in the claims are met by Osamu, Taku and Sato as set forth in the rejection.